

REMARKS

The examiner is thanked for the careful review and consideration of the prior reply and claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Gudjonsson. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the first and second terminals and first and second users are not the same terminal or user respectively. As such, Gudjonsson does not anticipate claim 1.

For example, Gudjonsson restricts modifications of a contact or buddy list via authentication of a particular user. Thus, the user of Gudjonsson's system is in control of who is on his or her own buddy list. There is no indication that Gudjonsson's list is the basis for enabling communications of a second user, who is not the same user as the first user, with those persons (or the terminals associated with the persons) a list that is maintained and modified by the first user. In other words, Gudjonsson does not disclose a second user, who is not the first user, who can establish communications with other persons based on a list that is maintained and modified by a first user, when the second user is using a first terminal.

This is true even during conferences as taught by Gudjonsson. For example, to set up a conference using Gudjonsson's system, the owner of the session provides a list of user's that may enter the conference. Column 28, lines 3-7. Also, entry to the conference is by invitation only. *Id.* Thus, if a particular user is not on the list he or she cannot be invited to the conference. But, claim 1 calls for a first terminal to be other than a selected second terminal. Thus, the invitees to Gudjonsson's conference are not first terminals for the simple reason that they are on the list. There is no such thing as a second user using a terminal that is not on the list to join a conference per Gudjonsson.

Simply, Gudjonsson fails to address restricting communications of one user based on a list that is maintained and modified by another user of his system. Thus, Gudjonsson fails to anticipate amended claim 1 and claims dependent thereon.

Under a similar analysis, amended claims 11 and 21 and respective dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Gudjonsson.

With respect to claim 8, Gudjonsson fails to disclose blocking communications to a second terminal that is *not* on a modifiable list. For example, as stated in the Office action, an invitation in Gudjonsson can be ignored via a Routing Service. But, the examiner's next sentence in the Office action acknowledges that a user on a list might enter a conference. As explained above, one must be invited to participate in a conference, and to be invited the recipient must be *on the list*. Also, if the Routing Service ignores an invitation, this action is on *behalf of the recipient* of the invitation as opposed to the recipient *being omitted from the list* to begin with. As such, for this additional reason claim 8 is believed to be patentable over Gudjonsson. Under a similar analysis claims 18 and 29 are also believed to be patentable over Gudjonsson.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0456US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2005



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906